

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Roger Pringle,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	Civil Action No. 5:19-3363-BHH
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
Indiana Government Officers & Agency,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
_____	)	

Petitioner Roger Pringle ("Petitioner") filed a *pro se* Petition for a Writ of Mandamus ("Petition") seeking release from prison. (ECF No. 1.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for initial review.

On December 10, 2019, Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, filed a Report and Recommendation ("Report") outlining the issues and recommending that the Court summarily dismiss the Petition without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Attached to the Report was a notice advising Petitioner of his right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed, and the time for doing so expired on January 1, 2019. (See ECF No. 13 (noting objections were due by December 27, 2019, with an additional three days to be added if served by mail).)

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to

which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge that this Court lacks jurisdiction and Petitioner’s claims against Respondent are subject to summary dismissal. Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 13) and dismisses this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

January 16, 2020  
Charleston, South Carolina

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.